

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 7, 25, 35, 36, and 37 have been amended. Claims 1-37 remain in the application. Further examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is hereby requested.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 7 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement in the Examiner believes that subject matter of claim 7 was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as the term "multi-color pixel" was described in the specification in numerous places such that one of relevant skill in the art would understand the claimed invention. For instance, on page 4, line 18, the Applicant states that "a multi-colored pixel corresponds to each mirror" and on page 6, line 5 states that "a pixel 22 is a multi-color pixel." The Applicant on line 9 goes on to say "that pixel may comprise any number of physical elements that can correspond to a polarized emission and produce a display." However, to help further distinguish and define Applicant's invention over the art made of record and to address the Examiner's concerns, the Applicant has amended claim 7 to address this issue. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection under 35 USC 112, 1st amendment for claim 7, as amended.

Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) under various references including in particular Nakanishi in view of Butler-Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's various rejections as there is no motivation within the references to combine Nakanishi with Butler-Smith and the Examiner is using the Applicants claimed invention as a template for making the combinations. In particular, Nakanishi disclosed a projection system with a color wheel 41 and an intensity wheel 42 that is used to raise limits of the response speed of the spatial light modulator. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art... to replace Nakanishi's color wheel 41 with Butler-Smiths color/polarizing wheel to provide distinct characteristic difference on the light of different colors by providing a different polarization for each of lights having different colors and defining sub-pixels to respond to each of colors and each of polarizations to display an image on the screen where the pixels/sub-pixels are implemented and thus produce a good stereoscopic display while taking

advantage of existing capability. However, Applicants are not trying to used the polarization to create a stereoscopic display but rather to address individual physical elements on the display to produce separate colors for each polarization. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 7, 25, 35, 36, and 37 to
5 further define and distinguish his invention over the prior art made of record.

In particular, the Applicant has amended claim 1 to indicate that the optically addressed display includes both a projection device and a screen. The projection device has a mechanism to create emissions having plural polarizations that define a corresponding number of color channels. The projection device also
10 has a data encoder to apply data for each of the color channels for each corresponding plural polarizations. A separate screen includes a plurality of pixels to produce a color display with a plurality of receptors. The plurality of receptors on the screen activate the pixels depending upon which is any of the plural polarizations are received. None of references made of record describe a screen
15 that has such receptors that receive various polarizations and decode them to create a color display. Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is believed patentable and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 7, 25, 35, and 36 are similarly amended. Claim 37 has been
20 amended to specifically claim just the screen itself. Claims 3, 7, 25, 35, 36, and 37 are believed patentable for the reasons expressed for claim 1 above. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

The remaining dependent claims are believed patentable based at least on
25 the patentability of the respective parent claims and withdrawal of the rejections and their allowance is also respectfully requested.

Applicant believes his claims as amended are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search
30 properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02. Accordingly, claims 1-37 are deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the Application other than in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's
35 undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this paper be considered a petition therefore.

5

Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department
1000 NE Circle Blvd.
Corvallis, OR 97330
Telephone: (541)715-4197
Fax: (541)715-8581

Respectfully Submitted,

Gregory J May

By: 

Timothy F. Myers

Patent Attorney

Registration No. 42,919